



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,489	08/01/2001	Fred S. Cook	1487	7107
28004	7590	06/05/2007		
SPRINT			EXAMINER	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY			PEACHES, RANDY	
KSOPHT0101-Z2100				
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,489

Applicant(s)

COOK, FRED S.

Examiner

Randy Peaches

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-21 and 23-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-21 and 23-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Regarding the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the arguments presented by the applicant are persuasive; therefore, the rejection of **claims 1, 3 - 7 and 24 - 26** are withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1,3-8,10-15,17-21 and 23-32**, has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding **claims 1, 3, 5 and 24-26**, the Applicant contends that an incoming call is routed to the second device instead of the first device and that the first device does not perform this routing. Instead, this task is initiated in **claims 1, 8 and 15** by way of the service control point transmitting a routing instruction, such as to a switch that performs the actual routing. The PBX generates routing instructions by processing a response message sent from a first device. As a result, the provision of the first device rerouting an incoming message to the second device, as described in the Office action, is not positively recited in the claims. Instead, the first device receives an alert message indicating the incoming call and caller information, and returns a response message to the service control point indicating a second device to receive the incoming call.

The Examiner, in contrast, would like to respectfully further explain that the first device does not "route" the incoming call, but merely sends a "process command" to a switch which re-directs the call to a second device. According to Diebolt et al., a process command is sent from a wireless device (first device) to a network and further

Art Unit: 2617

on to a second device. Specifically, the command only details what the command must perform and not the actual routing. See paragraph [0017]. This confirms that the first device does not perform the routing, but rather, as stated in paragraph [0018], a PBX, which acts as a SCP, whereby the routing instruction is generated. In addition, Diebolt et al., in this instant rejection, is used as a secondary reference to support the missing element/elements that are not clearly presented in the Action's primary reference.

Connolly et al. fails to clearly teach of transmitting a response message from a first device indicating a second device to receive an incoming call. The Examiner maintains that the secondary reference clearly supports the missing element of the primary reference.

Regarding **claims 24, 27 and 30** the Diebolt does not indicate that these messages are in response to an incoming call directed to the wireless communication device, as provided for in claims 24, 27 and 30. Instead, these messages (such as e-mail or fax) are apparently already stored on the data network, to be accessed by the wireless communication device at a later time. In other words, these e-mail or fax messages have already been received, and the process command allows the user access to access them after the fact. For example, a process command may be directed to a printer, which executes the command to provide "a print of the selected data." Thus, Diebolt does not teach or suggest the generation and transmission of a response message indicating a second device to receive the incoming call.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Diebolt et al. teaches in paragraph [0003] that the messages can be as diverse as emails, faxes and/or voice calls. The process

command of Diebolt et al. is used essentially to direct a call, email or fax to another device (second device) within the network. The Applicant again, details a clear example on page 9 of the Appeal Brief dated 1/19/2006, which is parallel to the functions exhibited by Diebolt et al. According to the response presented above and the following Office Action, **claims 1,3-8,10-15,17-21 and 23-32** stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3, 5 and 24-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) in view of Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Connolly et al discloses a method of operation with a service control point (SCP), the method comprising:

- receiving an AIN Information Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "call set-up message", from a Personal Communication System (PCS) Switching System – (PSC) into the said SCP via a PCS Switching Center (PSC) for an incoming call. Reference FIGURE 11, column 31 line 6-9, lines 58-61, respectively.

Art Unit: 2617

- processing the said AIN Information Analyzed to authenticate, which reads on claimed "identify", calling party or originating device (portable handset terminal), which reads on claimed "first device," hereinafter-referenced first device. See columns 31 lines 62-68 and column 32 lines 10-16;
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "routing instruction", from the said SCP. See column 31 lines 43-51.
- generating an AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), column 31 lines 24-25, which reads on claimed "alert message", indicating the user profile, which reads on claimed "call and caller information", from the call set-up message. See column 33 lines 17-20.
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement) to the calling party. See column 31 lines 24-25.
- receiving a said AIN Information Analyzed message from the said PCS into the said SCP wherein the said AIN message indicates a called party number and called party ID, which reads on claimed "receiving a response message into the said SCP from the first device," . See column 31 lines 60-61.
- processing the said AIN message to translate into AIN Route Analyzed message which details the routing, as taught in column 31 and 32 lines 62-68 lines 1-10, respectively, that connects the incoming call to the said called party, and
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "routing instruction", from the said SCP.

However, Connolly fails to clearly disclose wherein the said first device sends a response message indicating a second device to receive an incoming call.

Diebolt et al. teaches in paragraph [0017 – 0019] wherein the calling party is able to send a process command, which reads on claimed "alert message," that re-directs the incoming call to either a fax machine or printer, which reads on claimed "second device." The Applicant details in an example in the January 19, 2006, brief that

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) to include Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in order to provide a system capable of identifying an incoming call and redirecting a call to other device for further processing.

Regarding **claim 24**, Connolly et al discloses a method of operating a portable hand-set terminal, which reads on claimed, "first device is a wireless device", the method comprising:

- transmitting the a Page Response message from the said portable hand-set terminal to the Personal Communication System 2 (PCS2) then further to the said SCP, as taught in column 33 lines 10-23.

However, Connolly et al. fails to clearly disclose wherein the process of sending an alert message to a said second device.

Diebolt et al. teach of processing the said process command. See paragraph [0017];

- determining the incoming call should be directed to a second device. See paragraph [0017 and 0019];
- generating a response message indicating that the second device is receiving the incoming message. See paragraph [0019-0021].
- transmitting the said message from the said wireless device to the said PBX. See paragraph [0017-0018].

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) to include Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in order to provide a system capable of identifying an incoming call and redirecting a call to other device for further processing.

Regarding **claims 3 and 25**, as the combination of Connolly and Diebolt are made, the combination as claimed in **claims 2 and 24**, Connolly et al further teaches wherein the first device comprises a portable handset terminal. See Abstract and column 7 lines 53-57, FIGURE 11 and column 31 lines 4-9.

Regarding **claims 5 and 26**, as the combination of Connolly and Diebolt are made, the combination as claimed in **claims 1 and 24**, Connolly et al further discloses wherein the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), comprises a Redirecting Party ID, which reads on claimed "called party number". See column 32, line 6.

4. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) and Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in view of Koster (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111).

Regarding **claim 4**, as the combination of Connolly and Diebolt are made, the combination as claimed in **claim 1**, the combination fails to disclose wherein the call set-up message comprises a Transaction Capabilities Application Part query.

Koster teaches in columns 2 and 3 lines 41-67 lines 1-46, respectively, of a Transaction Capabilities Application Part message utilized as signaling transport medium containing instructions detrimental in a said AIN for call-set up purposes.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al and Diebolt et al. to included Koster (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111) in order provide a signaling means for the establishment of a call.

5. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) and Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in view of Serbetcioglu et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding **claim 6**, as the combination of Connolly and Diebolt are made, the combination as claimed in **claim 1**, the combination fails to disclose determining whether the incoming call is to be intercepted for a called party.

Serbetcioglu et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111) teaches in column 3 lines 16-21, of a feature server capable of intercepting an incoming call for a called subscriber and prompt the subscriber to speak his or her name or punch in a pin number.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al and Diebolt et al. to include Serbetcioglu et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111) in order to provide a means to intercept an incoming call for authorization purposes. In addition, in certain cases where the incoming call is subject to be a telefax or modem, the respected call will be directed accordingly.

6. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) and Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in view of Poole et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,590,965 B1).

Regarding **claim 7**, as the combination of Connolly and Diebolt are made, the combination as claimed in **claim 1**, the combination fails to disclose of the generation of a session for an incoming call with a session identifier.

Poole et al teaches in column 12 lines 18-31, of a session identifier and how it is used to identify the initiation of an incoming call.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al and Diebolt et al. to include Poole et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,590,965 B1) in order to identify the calling party's incoming call during the establishment of a call sequence.

7. **Claims 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) and Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in view of Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1).

Regarding **claim 8**, Connolly et al discloses a method of operation with a service control point (SCP), the method comprising:

- receiving an AIN Information Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "call set-up message", from a Personal Communication System (PCS) Switching System – (PSC) into the said SCP via a PCS Switching Center (PSC) for an incoming call. Reference FIGURE 11, column 31 line 6-9, lines 58-61, respectively.
- processing the said AIN Information Analyzed to authenticate, which reads on claimed "identify", calling party or originating device (portable handset terminal),

Art Unit: 2617

which reads on claimed "first device," hereinafter-referenced first device. See columns 31 lines 62-68 and column 32 lines 10-16;

- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "routing instruction", from the said SCP. See column 31 lines 43-51.
- generating an AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), column 31 lines 24-25, which reads on claimed "alert message", indicating the user profile, which reads on claimed "call and caller information", from the call set-up message. See column 33 lines 17-20.
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement) to the calling party. See column 31 lines 24-25.
- receiving a said AIN Information Analyzed message from the said PCS into the said SCP wherein the said AIN message indicates a called party number and called party ID, which reads on claimed "receiving a response message into the said SCP from the first device,". See column 31 lines 60-61.
- processing the said AIN message to translate into AIN Route Analyzed message which details the routing, as taught in column 31 and 32 lines 62-68 lines 1-10, respectively, that connects the incoming call to the said called party, and
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "routing instruction", from the said SCP.

However, Connolly fails to clearly disclose wherein the said first device re-routes the incoming message to a second device.

Diebolt et al. teaches in paragraph [0017 – 0019] wherein the calling party is able to send a process command, which reads on claimed "alert message," that re-directs the incoming call to either a fax machine or printer, which reads on claimed "second device." The Applicant details in an example in the January 19, 2006, brief that

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) to include Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in order to provide a system capable of identifying an incoming call and redirecting a call to other device for further processing.

However, the combination fails to disclose a processor that executes the said functions when a call is received at the SCP. In addition, the combination fails to disclose an interface connected to a processor.

Torba et discloses in column 12 lines 7-16, of a Service Control Point (SCP, 123) whose functionality is enhanced by a CTI processor (119). Torba et al further teaches that the said processor (119), in turn, enhances the functionality of the said SCP (123) by virtue of software provided by a host computer, which reads on claimed "storage medium operational to store the said software". Torba et al further teaches and represents a coupled interface between the said SCP (123) and CTI processor (119) in FIGURE 5.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al and Diebolt et al. to include Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) in order to incorporate a

Art Unit: 2617

software and processor, to execute the functions desired by the said SCP, into the architecture of the said SCP.

Regarding **claim 15**, Connolly et al discloses a method of operation with a service control point (SCP), the method comprising:

- receiving an AIN Information Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "call set-up message", from a Personal Communication System (PCS) Switching System – (PSC) into the said SCP via a PCS Switching Center (PSC) for an incoming call. Reference FIGURE 11, column 31 line 6-9, lines 58-61, respectively.
- processing the said AIN Information Analyzed to authenticate, which reads on claimed "identify", calling party or originating device (portable handset terminal), which reads on claimed "first device," hereinafter-referenced first device. See columns 31 lines 62-68 and column 32 lines 10-16;
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "routing instruction", from the said SCP. See column 31 lines 43-51.
- generating an AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), column 31 lines 24-25, which reads on claimed "alert message", indicating the user profile, which reads on claimed "call and caller information", from the call set-up message. See column 33 lines 17-20.
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement) to the calling party. See column 31 lines 24-25.

Art Unit: 2617

- receiving a said AIN Information Analyzed message from the said PCS into the said SCP wherein the said AIN message indicates a called party number and called party ID, which reads on claimed "receiving a response message into the said SCP from the first device,". See column 31 lines 60-61.
- processing the said AIN message to translate into AIN Route Analyzed message which details the routing, as taught in column 31 and 32 lines 62-68 lines 1-10, respectively, that connects the incoming call to the said called party, and
- transmitting the said AIN Route Analyzed message, which reads on claimed "routing instruction", from the said SCP.

However, Connolly fails to clearly disclose wherein the said first device re-routes the incoming message to a second device.

Diebolt et al. teaches in paragraph [0017 – 0019] wherein the calling party is able to send a process command, which reads on claimed "alert message," that re-directs the incoming call to either a fax machine or printer, which reads on claimed "second device." The Applicant details in an example in the January 19, 2006, brief that

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) to include Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in order to provide a system capable of identifying an incoming call and redirecting a call to other device for further processing.

However, the combination fails to clearly disclose a SCP interface connected to the processor that executes the said functions when a call is received at the SCP.

Torba et al teaches by disclosing an interface, represented between the said CTI processor (119) and the said SCP (123), operable as a transmission medium for processed messages performed by the said CTI processor (119). See FIGURE 5.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al and Diebolt et al. to include Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) in order to incorporate a said SCP interface, to execute the desired function of transmitting a call information to the respected said portable hand-set terminal, into the architecture of the said SCP.

Regarding **claims 10 and 17**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) and Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) are made, the combination according to **claims 9 and 16**, Connolly et al further teaches wherein first device comprises a portable handset terminal. See Abstract and column 7 lines 53-57, FIGURE 11 and column 31 lines 4-9.

Regarding **claims 12 and 19**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) and Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) are made, the combination according to **claims 8 and 15**, Connolly et al further discloses wherein the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), comprises a Redirecting Party ID, which reads on claimed "called party number". See column 32, line 6.

Regarding **claim 23**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) and Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) are made, the combination according to **claim 15**, Torba et al teaches in FIGURE 5, that a switch (127) is connected to the said SCP and configured to route incoming calls with the called party, which reads on claimed "second device." See column 12 lines 36-49.

8. **Claims 11 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1), Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) and in further view of Koster (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111).

Regarding **claims 11 and 18**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. and Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) are made, the combination according to **claims 8 and 15**, fail to disclose wherein the call set-up message comprises a Transaction Capabilities Application Part query.

Koster teaches in columns 2 and 3 lines 41-67 lines 1-46, respectively, of a Transaction Capabilities Application Part message utilized as signaling transport medium containing instructions detrimental in a said AIN for call-set up purposes.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent

Art Unit: 2617

Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1), Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) to further included Koster (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111) in order provide a signaling means for the establishment of a call.

9. **Claims 13 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1), Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) and in further view of Serbetcioglu et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111).

Regarding **claims 13 and 20**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. and Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) are made, the combination according to **claims 8 and 15**, fail to disclose determining whether the incoming call is to be intercepted for a called party.

Serbetcioglu et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111) teaches in column 3 lines 16-21, of a feature server capable of intercepting an incoming call for a called subscriber and prompt the subscriber to speak his or her name or punch in a pin number.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1), Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) to include Serbetcioglu et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,511,111) in order to provide a means to intercept an incoming call for

authorization purposes. In addition, in certain cases where the incoming call is subject to be a telefax or modem, the respected call will be directed accordingly.

10. **Claims 14 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1), Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) and in further view Poole et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,590,965 B1).

Regarding **claims 14 and 21**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. and Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) are made, the combination according to **claims 8 and 15**, fail to disclose of the generation of a session for an incoming call with a session identifier.

Poole et al teaches in column 12 lines 18-31, of a session identifier and how it is used to identify the initiation of an incoming call.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1), Torba et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,563,788 B1) to include Poole et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,590,965 B1) in order to allow the processor the capability to identify the calling party's incoming call during the establishment of a call sequence.

11. **Claims 27-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) in view of Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in view of Criss et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,643,506 B1).

Regarding **claim 27**, Connolly et al discloses a method of operating a portable hand-set terminal, which reads on claimed, "first device is a wireless device", the method comprising:

- transmitting the a Page Response message from the said portable hand-set terminal to the Personal Communication System 2 (PCS2) then further to the said SCP, as taught in column 33 lines 10-23.

However, Connolly et al. fails to clearly disclose wherein the process of sending an alert message to a said second device.

Diebolt et al. teach of processing the said process command. See paragraph [0017];

- determining the incoming call should be directed to a second device. See paragraph [0017 and 0019];
- generating a response message indicating that the second device is receiving the incoming message. See paragraph [0019-0021].
- transmitting the said message from the said wireless device to the said PBX. See paragraph [0017-0018].

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) to

Art Unit: 2617

include Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in order to provide a system capable of identifying an incoming call and redirecting a call to other device for further processing.

Criss et al teaches in column 8 lines 3-37 and in FIGURE 2, of an operating system stored in the memory (50), which reads on claimed "software storage medium" and is executed by the processor (40). The processor (40) can be programmed to control and to operate the various components of the mobile terminal, which reads on claimed "wireless communication device".

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) and Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) to included Criss et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,643,506 B1) in order to identify the software and processing means incorporated within the said portable handset terminal to execute the desired functions to establish a call.

Regarding **claim 28**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) Diebolt et al. and Criss et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,643,506 B1) are made, the combination according to **claim 27**, Connolly et al further teaches wherein the wireless communication device comprises a radio cell portable handset terminal, essentially representing a phone, which reads on claimed "cellular phone, pager, or a personal digital assistant". See Abstract and column 7 lines 53-57.

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding **claim 29**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) Diebolt et al. and Criss et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,643,506 B1) are made, the combination according to **claim 27**, Connolly et al further discloses wherein the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), comprises a Redirecting Party ID, which reads on claimed "called party number". See column 32, line 6.

12. **Claims 30-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419), Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in view of Janow (U.S. Patent Number 6,061,570 B1).

Regarding **claim 30**, Connolly et al discloses a method of operating a portable hand-set terminal, which reads on claimed, "first device is a wireless device", the method comprising:

- transmitting the a Page Response message from the said portable hand-set terminal to the Personal Communication System 2 (PCS2) then further to the said SCP, as taught in column 33 lines 10-23.

However, Connolly et al. fails to clearly disclose wherein the process of sending an alert message to a said second device.

Diebolt et al. teach of processing the said process command. See paragraph [0017];

- determining the incoming call should be directed to a second device. See paragraph [0017 and 0019];

- generating a response message indicating that the second device is receiving the incoming message. See paragraph [0019-0021].
- transmitting the said message from the said wireless device to the said PBX. See paragraph [0017-0018].

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to modify Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) to include Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) in order to provide a system capable of identifying an incoming call and redirecting a call to other device for further processing.

However, the combination fails disclose a processor operable to receive an incoming message and transmit the said message via an interface.

Janow teaches in claim language number 15, that the processor receives signals indicating an incoming message. In addition, Janow teaches in column 4 lines 8-11, that the processor is coupled to an interface circuit operable to send and receive messages.

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to the combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) Diebolt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0006811A1) to included Janow (U.S. Patent Number 6,061,570 B1) in order to provide a processing means incorporated therein a said portable hand-set terminal operable to receive incoming messages from a coupled interface.

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding **claim 31**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) Diebolt et al. and Janow (U.S. Patent Number 6,061,570 B1) are made, the combination according to **claim 30**, Connolly et al further teaches wherein the wireless communication device comprises a radio cell portable handset terminal, essentially representing a phone, which reads on claimed "cellular phone, pager, or a personal digital assistant". See Abstract and column 7 lines 53-57.

Regarding **claim 32**, as the above combination of Connolly et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,325,419) Diebolt et al. and Janow (U.S. Patent Number 6,061,570 B1) are made, the combination according to **claim 30**, Connolly et al further discloses wherein the said AIN Route Analyzed message (announcement), comprises a Redirecting Party ID, which reads on claimed "called party number". See column 32, line 6.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy Peaches whose telephone number is (571) 272-7914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Randy Peaches
RP



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER